



## DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20314-1000

REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF:

CECG

25 JUL 2000

MEMORANDUM FOR All USACE Activities and Employees

SUBJECT: Program and Project Management Business Process (PMBP)

1. The "PMBP REASSESSMENT 2000", report dated 21 May 2000, and the final recommendations contained in enclosure 1 that I hereby approve, culminates an effort that began before the Senior Leaders Conference (SLC) last year. The SLC provided the forum to explore important subjects including: how to enhance teamwork; how to engage middle management more fully and completely in the Program and Project Management Business Process (PMBP); what's working well and not so well in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; and, are changes needed to ER 5-1-11, Program and Project Management, overall and specifically to the eight imperatives.
2. We continued to debate these subjects periodically following the SLC. I concluded that a more in-depth analysis was needed to adequately address them. Accordingly, we commissioned a team of field practitioners and Headquarters staff (Project Delivery Team (PDT)) to reassess the state of the PMBP in the Corps and address these very important subjects.
3. I am happy to report the PDT, utilizing a Project Management Plan (PMP), accomplished a great deal and delivered a quality project within the established budget and a very tight schedule. Their work, summarized in the "PMBP REASSESSMENT 2000" report, and the contributions of every USACE employee that was interviewed and/or responded to the web based survey questionnaire, serves as an example of how teams can successfully work horizontally and vertically within the Corps. The report and this memorandum with enclosure will be accessible on the USACE web page within the next month.
4. More importantly though is the example this effort sets for the future execution of not just the visible work we accomplish for the Nation, but also the work that we do internally within the Corps for each other. All work that we accomplish is an integral part of project delivery and must be guided by the concepts of the PMBP, with its fundamental principles of empowering teams to produce quality work for our clients within established parameters of cost and schedule and in compliance with our policies and our Nation's laws.

CECG


SUBJECT: Program and Project Management Business Process (PMBP)

5. The ER 5-1-11 will be updated in the near future to incorporate the pertinent "PMBP REASSESSMENT 2000" report recommendations and other changes. For example, changing the name of the ER from "Program and Project Management" to "USACE Business Process" is one step to rectify the misconception that the ER is only for staff in the Program and Project Management organizations. I can't emphasize enough that ER 5-1-11 is applicable to all USACE Activities and every employee. It is the way we do business.

6. We will also establish a schedule for visits to subordinate commands to reintroduce the ER. Messrs. Steve Browning and Fred Caver will be coordinating those efforts. Expending a similar amount of time and energy to reintroduce the ER, as was accomplished to introduce the Corps Vision, will reap similar benefits.

7. I want to personally challenge each and every member of the Corps to take these principles and the enclosed recommendations to heart more than you ever have in the past. We have made significant strides in shifting the Corps from a functional approach to an empowered team approach for managing all of our work. As we further align ourselves and refocus our attention to the PMBP, we will continue the successes that will keep building the Corps as the premier engineering organization of the Nation.

Encl



JOEN BALLARD  
Lieutenant General, USA  
Commanding

# **PMBP REASSESSMENT 2000<sup>1</sup>**

## **FINAL CECG APPROVED RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **1. Retain the USACE Strategic Vision.**

  X   Concur        Concur with comment        Non-Concur

Vision Link: With retained focus on the Strategic Vision (Vision) we ensure continued forward progress on the path to building the "world's premier engineering organization...prepared for the 21st century."

Observations: The Vision has been well received. The interviews and web-based survey indicate that all levels of the Corps, from the highest executives to student hires in remote field offices, know of the Vision. Investment in the Vision is reshaping our culture, and is leading us to be the world's premier engineering organization.

Findings: Cultural change does not happen overnight. Organization and mission can change but the Vision is timeless. We need to stay the course and continue the momentum. With retained focus on the Vision we ensure continued forward progress.

### **2.(a). Change the first imperative in ER 5-1-11 (ER) to read: "All work is an integral part of project delivery."**

  X   Concur        Concur with comment        Non-Concur

### **2.(b). Establish the Project Delivery Team (PDT) as the foundational unit for performing all work.**

  X   Concur        Concur with comment        Non-Concur

### **2.(c). Change the title of the ER and the process it describes to the "USACE Project Delivery Process" (USACE-PDP).**

       Concur   X   Concur with comment        Non-Concur

- Concur with findings, but not with this part of the recommended solution.  
-Alternative recommendation: Change the name of the ER to "USACE Business Process", and indicate that the fundamental USACE Business Process is the PMBP. Do not change the name of the process itself. Our District Commanders and MSCs indicated that changing the name would hamper their effort to get our workforce to recognize PM as a process, not a stovepipe.

Vision Link: "Make life simple for all - develop and use common business processes throughout the Corps."

---

<sup>1</sup> NOTE: The Vision Link, Observations, Findings and Recommendations from the "PMBP Reassessment 2000" report dated 21 May 2000 were modified by HQUSACE, and are hereby superseded, to incorporate the approved acronym, PMBP, and alternative recommendations, clarifications and comments in the Final CECG Approved Recommendations that follow.

Observations: A great number of the employees interviewed did not know of the ER or the principles of project management. Most of the survey respondents did not believe the ER is related to their job, and in fact, many have not even read it. Most thought the ER was only for people in Programs and Project Management Division (PPMD).

Findings: The project definition imperative in the ER is used by some to exclude themselves from the PMBP. Clearly stating that all work is part of project delivery will eliminate this opportunity. People have not read the ER because ERs are usually narrowly focused at specific technical areas, and people assume that an ER titled "Program and Project Management" applies only to PPMD. This has prevented many technical and support staff from fully understanding the process. It is evident from the interviews that the ER would be better known and understood if it had been marketed to the workforce like the Strategic Vision. The title of the ER and the process it describes needs to be clear, concise and recognized as applicable to all USACE elements.

**3. Review all existing and freeze all new USACE policies (regulations, circulars, directives, letters, memoranda, and operating procedures). Establish a standing Project Delivery Team (PDT), reporting directly to the DCG, to review and revise all policies for consistency with the PMBP.**

     Concur   X   Concur with comment      Non-Concur

- Concur, with clarifications. Coordinating regulations for consistency is not a one-time effort, but must be on going after the "stand down" ends.
  - Recommend the CG issue a memo directing all proponents to review their regulations and revise them as necessary to comply with ER 5-1-11. This effort should take place after the revision to ER 5-1-11 is issued to avoid rework. As part of the review process, recommend that existing policy documents be consolidated as much as possible. That is, all policy related to a given phase or type of work should be consolidated and simplified. For example, all regulations related to construction S&A management should be consolidated in one unified document. The proposed "standing PDT" would review these revisions and all future guidance for consistency with the PMBP before they are issued.
  - Recommend HQUSACE adopt the PMBP as the fundamental process used for developing all policy. Use of cross-functional teams including field personnel to develop policy will in itself avoid much of the lack of consistency and coordination.

Vision Link: "Develop innovative approaches to dramatically increase unity of effort and a corporate approach to business - "All for one and one for all""

Observations: The survey, interviews, and personal experiences of the team all recognize that many USACE policies are not synchronized or are in conflict with each other, the PMBP and/or the Vision.

Findings: Various proponent groups in HQUSACE prepare policy documents. Many policies were written years ago and have not been updated. Therefore, many policies conflict with the PMBP.

**4. Indoctrinate the entire USACE workforce in the PMBP.**

☐ Concur ☒ Concur with comment ☐ Non-Concur

- Concur, with clarification.  
-Recommend a USACE team be established to develop and implement a plan for fully integrating the PMBP and QM concepts into all facets of our organization and work, similar to how the USACE Vision was implemented. This plan should take advantage of our strategic planning process (Campaign Plans, OPLANS), and address ways to communicate the message to everyone in USACE, integrate the concepts into our business processes, and continuous reinforcement.

Vision Link: "Develop Corps doctrine and tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTP) focused on district and division operations." "Make a quantum leap -reinforce project management as the process we use to manage project delivery."

Observations: USACE staff at all levels neither have a clear understanding of the PDP nor the project management matrix concept that will be used to drive the process. Many PDT members have not been exposed to the ER nor have senior leaders fully grasped the process.

Findings: USACE did not indoctrinate the PMBP throughout the Corps on a systematic and continuous basis. If this had been done, it would have resulted in improved overall implementation and greater efficiencies in executing projects by PDT. Without planned indoctrination there will continue to be confusion and lack of a clarified direction on fully implementing the project management matrix concept adopted by USACE.

**5. Empower Commanders to affect high-graded developmental assignments within their command, pending concurrence of the senior rater at the next higher level.**

☐ Concur ☒ Concur with comment ☐ Non-Concur

- Concur, with comment. Developmental cross-training assignments at high grades can be highly effective at helping individuals with narrow backgrounds gain a more corporate perspective. Cross-training assignments at lower grades can also be highly beneficial. We should encourage cross-training early in our employees' careers to ensure they have a broad, corporate view by the time they rise to the GS 14/15 level. Experience in more than one USACE functional area and/or echelon should be preferred in high-grade selections.
- Further, under current guidance developmental assignments involving high-grade positions must be competitive. There an opportunity to facilitate team building, cooperation and a better understanding of the mission through "job swaps" for senior level employees (GS-15's) in the same geographical location as one year details.

The Chief approved this concept which will be included in a change to the Corporate Recruitment and Selection Policy (ER 690-1-1203) in the near future.

Vision Link: "We will seek and develop a workforce with diverse attributes and talents."

Observations: Some senior leaders who have served in the same organizational element for all or most of their careers, tend to have views that are not corporate. This viewpoint can create real or perceived imbalances of relationships.

Findings: Developmental assignments have not been fully utilized to develop inter-organizational experience in the senior leadership. This lack of experience has to some extent negatively impacted corporate teamwork, implementation of the PDP and performance of the PDT.

**6. Direct a synchronized and integrated implementation of the PMBP.**

☐ Concur ☒ Concur with comment ☐ Non-Concur

- Concur, with comments as per Recommendation #4.

Linkage to vision: "Focus periodic command reviews on implementation of campaign plans and accomplishment of strategic goals and objectives."

Observations: The PMBP is not uniformly applied. USACE commands are implementing the PMBP inconsistently when compared to implementation of the Vision.

Findings: HQUSACE has not established a strategic plan to orderly implement the PMBP. Divisions must prepare regional campaign plans and districts must develop operation plans. Headquarters and Divisions should evaluate the implementation of each plan using a PDT.

**7. Align all USACE echelons using three groups: Programs & Project Management (Combat Arms)-Technical Services (Combat Support)- Support Services (Combat Services Support).**

☐ Concur ☒ Concur with comment ☐ Non-Concur

- Concur with findings, but not with this recommended solution. The matrix team concept is not well understood across USACE. Individuals do not understand how they fit into the matrix, or what their role is on the team or in support of the team. -Alternative Recommendation: The implementation plan for integrating the PMBP and QM concepts must include clarifying roles and responsibilities of all USACE elements in the matrix team concept. Develop standard business process manual that can be used as a training tool to support this and other requirements.

Vision Link: "Organize at each echelon to align with the Corps Vision and Strategic Plan. Starting at the top and flowing throughout the organization... organize to align to new processes."

Observations: Military organizations are aligned to be interoperable at all echelons, thereby facilitating command and control. A corporate goal is to align HQUSACE and MSCs to match that of the districts. Our observations document that there is no standard district alignment making achievement of the higher order goal impossible. We have a unique opportunity to build a symbiosis of our military and civilian structure to capitalize on a uniform alignment to achieve the Vision.

Findings: HQUSACE has not determined a standard organizational alignment. The war fighting organization is designed to identify, engage and defeat the threat. Likewise, USACE command and control should be aligned to quickly meet the nation's needs. This will allow the command and control of any district to fall under any division and the staff coordination functions will work.

**8. Establish at all USACE subordinate commands (Centers, Districts, and FOAs) a three tiered decision making structure consisting of Project Delivery Teams (PM and subject matter experts), an Operating Board (selected middle managers), and a Corporate Board (Commander and selected senior leaders).**

☐ Concur ☒ Concur with comment ☐ Non-Concur

- Concur with findings, but think this solution is "below the line". Establishing a team of middle managers to resolve resource and workload conflicts across functional boundaries on a day-to-day basis is an excellent recommendation, and should be encouraged. However, we think establishment of this team as a formal Board is a "below the line" call, and should not be required by regulation. The graphics and terminology for this recommendation could be interpreted as adding another layer to a decision-making structure, in a hierarchy, which could disempower our teams. This must be clarified to avoid unintended results.  
-Alternative Recommendation: Encourage Districts to establish a middle management team, to take the load of daily resourcing issues off the corporate board, and fully engage middle management in supporting PDTs. ER 5-1-11 should clarify the important role middle managers play in the PMBP.

Vision Link: "Dramatically improve vertical and horizontal communications between all echelons and functional areas."

Observations: Too many people are making decisions because they like making decisions and no longer focus on their area of operation. Many commands effectively use middle management to operate the day-to-day business of the command (Operating Board). In commands where a three tiered decision structure was used, there was better teamwork and positive results. The team observed that most Corporate Boards and PDTs were functioning fairly well. The disconnect seemed to be everything in-

between. The command and control lanes for middle management are overlapping and creating multiple layers of management. These layers confuse and reduce the effectiveness of PDTs. Other than that, interviewees and survey respondents were generally satisfied with

middle management. However, the team observed that many middle managers do not think corporately.

Findings: There is no uniform decision making team structure in place at all districts. Incorporating teamwork, keeping people in their decision making lanes, and flattening the decision matrix, improves the timeliness and quality of decisions. With this structure the corporate board can focus on long-term (beyond 1 year) decision making, the operating board can focus on short-term (1 year or less) decision making and the PDTs can focus on the project. Without this structure the decision making process is slow, cumbersome and often requires reversal at a higher level. The role of middle management is not clearly defined, but is critical to promote corporate recruitment, selection, training, development, supervision, and mentoring of the USACE team.

**9.(a). Encourage all Support Services use the PMBP.**

       Concur   X   Concur with comment        Non-Concur

- Concur, with clarifications. We have already stated that all work in USACE will be done under the umbrella of the PMBP, so there is no need to single out Support Services. There are other functions not currently following the PMBP.

**9.(b). The Deputy Commander is responsible for Support Services.**

       Concur   X   Concur with comment        Non-Concur

- Concur with findings, but think this solution is "below the line". Making the Deputy Commander responsible for representing the "Support Services" on the Corporate Board makes sense, and would ensure the small offices such as PAO, EEO, Safety, and others are adequately represented, without creating an imbalance on the board. District size and structures vary, and we think each District Commander should determine how to represent Support Services on the Corporate Board.

Vision Link: "Operate as a team - develop incentives that reward an integrated approach to problem solving". "We can not - must not - become fragmented in our execution this is imperative for unity of effort."

Observations: Support services have a significant impact on the PDT's ability to effectively execute projects. For example, untimely personnel recruitment, logistic support, and provision of IT equipment and support is contributing to PDT execution failure.

Findings: The support services are critical to the PMBP. It is mandatory that they support the PDTs and technical elements by using the PMBP philosophy and process. However, in many cases, project management teamwork, scheduling and other



processes are not used. Support services are not always represented on the corporate team, consequently, they should be represented on the Corporate Board by the Deputy Commander, and where appropriate, be represented on the Operating Board and PDTs.

**10. Change ER-5-1-11 dealing with quality and safety to convey:**

**- Life Safety is non- negotiable.**

**- Project Delivery Teams are responsible for the quality of the projects, products & technical services.**

**- The PDT resolves disputes over quality at the lowest echelons possible.**

**Otherwise, the PDT, including the DPM and Technical Chief(s), will jointly present the issues to the Commander.**

**- The Commander has ultimate responsibility for quality and safety.**

**Concur   X   Concur with comment        Non-Concur**

- Concur, with clarifications. The Chief has already directed that the Quality Management concepts contained in the new draft QM ER be fully incorporated into ER 5-1-11. The approach to dispute resolution must be carefully addressed to avoid disempowering our PDTs. Issues must be worked and resolved within the team.

Vision Link: "We produce products and services that fully meet customer expectations of quality..."

Observations: Alarmingly, unilateral decisions are being made under duress of schedule pressures without full regard for technical input. People have expressed concern that projects are being completed where quality has not been a primary consideration.

Findings: Quality is a major project objective. Considering the significance of resulting potential for quality failure, a resolution process must be established and implemented. The project should not be driven by cost and schedule at the expense of quality and safety.